



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,792	11/21/2003	David A. Monroe	07-0167	2942
67589	7590	08/24/2007		
MOORE LANDREY 1609 SHOAL CREEK BLVD AUSTIN, TX 78701			EXAMINER TRAORE, FATOUMATA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2136	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/24/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,792

Applicant(s)

MONROE, DAVID A.

Examiner

Fatoumata Traore

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/03/2006 and 10/18/2006
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response of the original filing of November 21, 2003. Claims 1-17 are pending and have been considered below.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-12, 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Khan et al (US 20030126121).

Claim 1: khan et al discloses a multi-media surveillance system having a plurality of sensors each adapted to produce an IP sensor signal when activated, the IP sensor signal adapted for being transmitted over an IP network to a remote monitor station for managing the signal to provide surveillance data to authorized personnel(paragraph [0043]), the system comprising:

An biometric data collection device adapted for converting the collected data to an IP protocol for generating a biometric signal for distribution over a network (The image detector captures the facial image of the individual. The image is

converted into a biometric template and then transmitted by the police's car radio to a local receiver within range. The receiver then transmits the signal to a portal (1212) to the communications network (100). The query is then transmitted to the server for transmission to one or more databases (64))(paragraph [0049], [0054]);

A remote station for receiving and managing the biometric data (The database (64) will include a search engine (720) capable of receiving (740) a query from a server (62) through the network (100) including a target biometric template to be searched. The search engine (720) will search the database (64) and comparing the target biometric template to all of the biometric templates contained in the database to identify potential matches) (paragraph [0049], [0054] Figs. 7 and 8).

Claim 2: **khan et al** discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 1 above, and further discloses a server at the remote station for receiving and managing the biometric data (paragraph [0049], [0054] and Fig 10).

Claim 3: **khan et al** discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 1 above, and further discloses that the biometric collection device is an image collector (These images may be photographic images or they may be contained in a database of digitized images in a gif, tif, jpeg or similar image format)(paragraph [0048] and Fig. 7).

Claim 4: **khan et al** discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 3 above, and further discloses that the image collector is a camera for collecting a facial image and wherein the biometric data is a facial image data (each digital video image created by the face recognition software to ensure that the required facial features can be accurately extracted)(paragraphs [0022], [0023], [0034], [0054] and Figs. 4 and 5).

Claim 6: **khan et al** discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 3 above, and further discloses a server at the remote station for receiving and managing the facial image data (paragraph [0049], [0054] and Fig 10).

Claim 7: **khan et al** discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 6 above, and further discloses that the server includes a facial image database and adapted for comparing the facial image data with data in the facial image database (The query includes the target biometric template to be searched. The search engine will compare each of the biometric templates in the database to the target biometric template (810))(paragraph [0050]).

Claim 9: **khan et al** discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 1 above, and further discloses that the remote station is a wireless monitor (The workstation computer is connected by way of a wireless connection (1206) to a

local receiver (1210) that is within range of the police car radio transmitter (1208)(paragraph [0054]).

Claim 11: khan et al discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 1 above, and further discloses that the remote station is a desktop personal computer (paragraphs [0042], [0044]).

Claims 10, 12: khan et al discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 1 above, and further discloses that the remote station is a laptop/PDA computer (paragraphs [0042], [0044]).

Claim 17: khan et al discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 2 above, and further discloses a storage device for archiving the collected data (paragraphs [0025], [0026]).

Claim 18: khan et al discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 17 above, and further discloses a data mining system (data searching system) for mining the archived collected data (paragraph [0023]).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2136

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan et al (US 20030126121) in view of Sah (US 7177448).

Claim 5: khan et al discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 4 above, but does not explicitly disclose the use of a plurality of cameras throughout a network for collecting image data. However, Sah discloses a system for selecting and transmitting image of interest to user which further discloses a plurality of cameras throughout a network for collecting facial image data throughout the network (the cameras 150 are addressable through the network 120. For one embodiment, the plurality of cameras 150 is coupled to an on-site camera control system 140. The on-site camera control system 140 permits the cameras 150 to be programmed. The on-site camera control system 140, as will be described in more detail below, sends the images collected from the various cameras 150 to the image server 11)(column 3, lines 1-14 and Fig. 1a).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a plurality of cameras in a network in Khan et al's disclosure. One would have been motivated to do so in order to make an image accessible from a remote location.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan et al (US 20030126121) in view of Lapsley et al (US20020019811).

Claim 8: khan et al discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 6 above, but does not explicitly disclose a step of using a third party controlled database. However, Lapsley et al discloses a biometric financial transaction system, which further discloses that the remote station adapted for sending and receiving facial image data to a third party controlled database (paragraph [0018]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a plurality of cameras in a network in Khan et al's disclosure. One would have been motivated to protect against attempts to retrieve critical information.

7. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan et al (US 20030126121) in view of Wada et al (US 6714236).

Claim 13: khan et al discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose an access control device. However, Wada et al discloses a security camera system, which further discloses an access control device responsive to an activation signal and wherein the control device is activated upon confirmation of biometric data collected by the biometric



collector (to provide controller with moving picture detection means for detecting a motion) (column 1, lines 39-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to activate the access control based on detecting a motion in Khan et al's disclosure. One would have been motivated to do so in order to identify the access point and take protective actions based on the identification result.

Claim 14: khan et al discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the remote station further include a system map and a display monitor. However, Wada et al discloses a security camera system, which further that the remote station further including a system map database and a display monitor for displaying the system map, the map including an icon (target) for identifying the location of the biometric data collection device (each monitor target is registered in a preset table with such the operation executed for each of the monitor targets)(column 6, lines 23-44, column 6, lines 63-67, and Figs. 1, 2, 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a mapping and monitoring action in Khan et al's disclosure. One would have been motivated to do so in order to identify the access point and take protective actions based on the identification result.

Claim 15: khan et al discloses a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 14 above, but does not explicitly disclose an identifying icon for each of said plurality of biometric data collection devices. However, Wada et al discloses a security camera system, which further that the plurality of biometric data collection devices and wherein there is an identifying icon for each of said plurality of biometric data collection devices (the memory 77 of the controller 70 stores a preset table 88 in which monitoring targets are registered; an auto tracing table in which automatic monitoring procedure is registered; and a map denoting a monitoring area of the composite camera) (column 5, lines 24-28 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a mapping and monitoring action in Khan et al's disclosure. One would have been motivated to do so in order to identify the access point and take protective actions based on the identification result.

8. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan et al (US 20030126121) in view of Wada et al (US 6714236) as applied to claim 15 above, and in further view of Waehner et al (US 20030142853).

Claim 16: khan et al and Wada et al disclose a multi-media surveillance system as in claim 15 above, while neither of them explicitly discloses a step of tracking the progress of an individual. However, Waehner et al discloses a security

identification system, which further discloses a step of tracking the progress of an individual as he moves from one biometric collection device to the next biometric collection device (Sensor detects motion in the near proximity of post activating one of the instructional messages such as stop. Sensor 19 continuously monitors the movements of the individual) (paragraph [0056]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined method of khan et al and Wada et al such as to track the progress of an individual. The motivation of doing so would have been to protect access to the secure environment by triggering an alarm if the subject exits the area prematurely or does not stop after being instructed to do so as taught by Waehner et al.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fatoumata Traore whose telephone number is (571) 270-1685. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and every other Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nassar G. Moazzami, can be reached on (571) 272 4195. The fax phone


Art Unit: 2136

number for Formal or Official faxes to Technology Center 2100 is (571) 273-8300. Draft or Informal faxes, which will not be entered in the application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 270-2685.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

FT  
Tuesday August 21, 2007

Nassar G. Moazzami  
Supervisory Patent Examiner

  
8,21,07